

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Butte)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LESLEY WILLIAM FRANKLIN, JR.,

Defendant and Appellant.

C087682

(Super. Ct. No. 18CF02199)

Appointed counsel for defendant Lesley William Franklin, Jr., filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asked this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we affirm the judgment.

BACKGROUND

On April 24, 2018, Paradise police were called to a report of an abandoned dog tied to a pole outside a pharmacy. The report included a description of a man who fit

defendant's description. When contacted, defendant provided a name that was not his to the police and was arrested for providing false identification. He was carrying a concealed kitchen knife. Police also learned he was a Penal Code section 290¹ registrant, who had failed to update his annual registration as required.

Defendant pleaded no contest to carrying a concealed dirk or dagger (§ 21310) and failure to update registration annually (§ 290.012, subd. (a)), and admitted a prior prison term (§ 667.5, subd. (b)). The trial court sentenced him to a four-year eight-month state prison term, imposed various fines and fees, and awarded 73 days of presentence credits (37 actual and 36 conduct).

Defendant appeals. He did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and requesting that this court review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised of his right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we have received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

/s/
Duarte, J.

We concur:

/s/
Hull, Acting P. J.

/s/
Butz, J.